

McCall, Brandon

From: CRENSHAW, CHARLES R PW <charles.crenshaw@pw.utc.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 07, 2013 3:54 PM
To: Jud Testimony
Subject: Charles Crenshaw Testimony of April 5, 2013

Testimony Supporting Raised Bill H.B. 6688

April 5, 2013

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak for the next 4 minutes and 38 seconds on behalf of Raised Bill No. 6688.

My name is Crenshaw, Charles Crenshaw and I live in the town of Bloomfield.

Some of you may remember that I testified before this committee last year on Raised Bill No. 5509.

Mr. Maturo and I have spoken about our testimonies, and I am in agreement with what he has already presented, and see no need to repeat his words of appreciation to those who have drafted this bill, nor to repeat his specific support of this bill.

However, I am here today to offer my limited support for this bill. I agree that this bill is a step in the right direction, and I'm glad to see that the issue of alimony is finally getting some attention.

However, I am concerned that this bill, as written, does not adequately or specifically address the issue of life time or permanent alimony. The language is still vague, unclear, and subject to interpretation. With this bill, alimony awards will continue to be random, arbitrary, and discretionary depending on the individual goal or attitude of the judge.

If this bill goes forward, it should do so with the understanding that the issue of life time alimony is to be studied and reviewed. If I have read this bill correctly, Section 5 speaks to this issue, and states that The Legislative Program Review and Investigative Committee is to report back on or before February 1, 2014, and present recommendations to the General Assembly and the Chief Court Administrator. Let us make sure this happens.

I would also like to suggest that the committee reviewing this issue be comprised of a diverse group of individuals, so that we do not have a situation where the foxes are making laws governing the security of the hen house.

The issue of life time alimony is near and dear to my heart, as I am currently under a divorce ruling, to provide alimony to my ex wife until death, or until she remarries. I have been paying a substantial amount of alimony for years, with no end in sight.

I am one month shy of my 69th birthday, and two months shy of my 45th anniversary at my place of employment. I should have retired at least seven years ago at the age of 62; however, being chained and shackled this carcass of a dead marriage inhibits me from going forward with my life. The term, "Until death do us part" has new meaning.

Meanwhile, my ex wife (who is the one who conscientiously desired and initiated this so called no fault divorce) is physically, mentally, and educationally capable of obtaining employment to adequately support herself and achieve financial independence. Why do I have to keep working to support someone who is capable of supporting herself and elected to end the marriage for no good reason? Why is she allowed to profit from my hard work and my dreams?

This system of marital welfare encourages my ex to maintain low or no income so as not to jeopardize her eligibility to continue to receive alimony. Even the public welfare system has a termination point, and one has to periodically demonstrate eligibility for welfare by actively seeking employment. In the case of marital welfare, all one has to do is breathe air, take nourishment, and maintain a 98.6 degree body temperature.

I would suggest the review of the alimony statutes of other states that have provided guidelines for alimony. For example, a Rhode Island general law states that

“alimony is designed to provide support for a reasonable length of time to enable the recipient to become financially independent and self-sufficient.”

It's time that Ct alimony statutes be brought into the 21st century and be revised to be more reasonable, sensible, and to allow the payers to move on with their lives free of this never ending financial burden.

In summary, I cautiously support raised bill 6688 with the stipulation that further study be conducted on the issue of life time or permanent marital welfare, a.k.a., alimony. I am not opposed to alimony. I am opposed to the arbitrary granting of permanent alimony, unless there is a just cause.

Again, I thank you for allowing me to speak today, and I would now be glad to address any questions or comments any of you may have.

Charles R. Crenshaw

14 Brentwood Drive

Bloomfield, Ct. 06002

E-mail: charles.crenshaw@pw.utc.com

Home Phone: 860-242-2019

Work Phone: 860-565-3702

Cell Phone: 860-712-4844